

III) IN THE DRAWING

Two replacement sheets of drawing are provided herewith, adding the reference numeral 60 for the bolt as required by the Examiner.

IV) REMARKS

The Examiner stated in the Office action that the references in the IDS filed March 17, 2005 were not considered. However, the copy of form 1449 provided to the Applicant with the Office action denote the Examiner's initials of the references, indicating that the references were in fact considered by the Examiner. This was confirmed in a subsequent telephone call to the Examiner by the undersigned.

The Examiner objected to the drawing since they did not include the reference numeral 60 for the bolt. Replacement sheets for the drawing have been included herewith, making the required corrections.

The Examiner objected to the specification on page 4, line 8, where "base member 40" should read "base member 30". This correction to the specification has been made herein.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims to eliminate phrases "or the like" etc. Applicant now refers to the object to be supported by the wall bracket as a "body" in order to encompass all items contemplated by the invention as described in the specification.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,251,859 to Cyrell et al. Claims 1, 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being

anticipated by US Patent No. 4,936,533 to Adams et al. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyrell. Claims 11-1 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyrell in view of US Patent 1,086,375 to LaFrance. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyrell in view of US Patent No. 4,765,580 to Wright. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyrell in view of US Patent No 7,155,027 to Lee. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 6, 8, 9 and 15 are indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Applicant has therefore amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 6 and has cancelled claim 6 accordingly. Thus, claim 1 as amended is in condition for allowance. Since all the remaining claims depend from claim 1 directly or indirectly, they are also in condition for allowance.

With respect to the Examiner's comments on page 7, it is noted that this application is prior art to Lin 6915996 and Pincek US 2007/0040085 and not vice versa.

It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/arbarkume/

Anthony R. Barkume
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 33,831

June 18, 2007
20 Gateway Lane
Manorville, NY 11949
(631) 259-9099